PTO/SB/21 (04-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

10/062,957

January 31, 2002

Anger the Papework Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Filing Date

Application Number

TRANSMITTAL **FORM**

First Named Inventor Guo, Fangjiang Art Unit 3643 (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Griles, Bethany L **Examiner Name** Attorney Docket Number | 88164 000002 Total Number of Pages in This Submission

TOLA	I Number of Page	s III Tilis Oubiliissio	11	Attorney Docket Null	ibei	88104.000002
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)						
	Fee Transmittal Fee Attached			Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers		After Allowance communication to Group Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
Ø	Amendment/Reply			Petition	⊠	Appeal Communications to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
	After Final - Response to Restriction Requirement			Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information
	☐ Affidavit/decla	aration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter
	Extension of Time Request			Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
	Express Abandonment Request			Request for Refund		
	Information Disclosure Statement			CD, Number of CD(s)		
	Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks			
	Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under					
	37 CFR 1.52					
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm or R Individual name		Roger Aceto, HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP				
Signature		Voger Heel				
Date		September 24, 2004				

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service

with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

Type or printed name Mary DiPaolo Date 9/24/04 September 24, 2004 Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Guo, Fangjiang

Atty. Docket:

88164.000002

Serial No.:

10/062,957

Examiner:

Griles, Bethany L.

Filed:

January 31, 2002

Art Unit:

3643

Title:

SYSTEM FOR THE PRESENTATION OF ANIMALS TO BE MILKED AND

METHOD

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Requirement for Restriction mailed August 25, 2004, Applicant hereby elects the claims of Group IV (Claims 32-41) with traverse.

The Examiner has reopened prosecution of this case after Appeal and has imposed a five-way restriction. Applicant has elected to prosecute the claims of Group IV (Claims 32-41) in this case with traverse in that Applicant considers that the Claims of Group II (Claims 12-21), Group III (Claims 22-31) and Group V (Claims 42-51) are properly maintained in a single application.

1. Groups II and IV

As between the elected Group IV claims and the Group II claims, the Examiner says they are distinguished in that the claims of Group II "are drawn to rearwardly loading an animal into a milking stall from a cart, classified in <u>class</u>

119, subclass 412" whereas the claims of Group IV "are drawn to moving an

animal into a transport cart and then into a milking stall, classified in <u>class 119</u>, <u>subclass 412</u>" (emphasis added).

The fact that the Examiner as put both groups of claims in the same class and subclass, supports a finding that there is no adequate basis for insisting on the restriction. Certainly, requiring a restriction leading to two separate searches of the same class and subclass merely duplicates the Examiner's effort.

That said, Applicant urges that the Examiner here has misclassified the invention. Class 119, subclass 412 relates to a railroad car for transporting animals having "partition means". The claims of both Group II and Group IV are directed to methods for presenting an animal to be milked and have nothing whatsoever to do with a railroad car partition means.

The Examiner says that "Group II could be used to transport chattel to a remote location via a cart, and Group IV could be used to move chattel within a warehouse or other storage facility." However, the claim limitations recite the method step of moving an animal from the cart and into a milking stall. This makes it clear that the invention resides in a method of moving an animal to be milked by cart to an unoccupied milking stall. Saying the cart might have other uses is not appropriate here and ignores the method steps recited involving a specific use of the cart, that is the moving of an animal to be milked from the cart and into an unoccupied milking stall.

2. Groups III and IV

As between the elected Group IV claims and the Group III claims, the Examiner says they are distinguished in that the claims of Group III "are drawn to loading an animal into a transport cart and then moving the animal to a new location, classified in Class 119 subclass 408" whereas the claims of Group IV "are drawn to moving an animal into a transport cart and then into a milking stall, classified in class 119, subclass 412" (emphasis added).

Applicant first points out that the Group III claims recite that the animal is moved to "an unoccupied milking stall" and not merely to a "new location".

Accordingly, the claims of both groups require translating the cart (with the

animal thereon) to an unoccupied milking stall and not merely "to a new location" as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant also submits that the step of "loading an animal onto a transport cart" of Group III (Claim 22) is comparable to the step of "moving a first animal to be milked onto a first transport cart" of the Group IV (Claim 32). Applicant sees no significance for purposes of restriction between "loading" an animal onto a cart and "moving" an animal onto a cart.

Thus, both the claims of Group III and Group IV are directed to a method including the steps of

- loading (or moving) an animal to be milked onto a cart;
- translating the cart to an unoccupied milking stall; and then
- loading (or moving) the animal from the cart and into the milking stall.

The Examiner justifies the restriction by reference to the classification of the inventions in different classes (Group III being in Class119, subclass 408 and Group IV being in Class 119, subclass 412). However these classes broadly relate to railroad cars and have nothing whatsoever to do.with.milking. Class 119/408 concerns railroad cars having "feeding and watering means" and class 119/412 concerns railroad cars having "partition means". Neither a partition means nor feeding/watering means are recited in the Group III and IV claims so the class designation made by the Examiner is in error.

Applicant urges that an appropriate classification is in class 119 subclass 14 (broadly "Milkers") and that an appropriate search already has been made. This is evidenced by the four references used in the rejection of the claims of Groups III and IV all being classified in Class 119, subclasses 14.02 and 14.03; the same reference from subclass 14.02 (Waybright, US 5 483, 921) being applied in the rejection of the independent claims of both groups.

The Examiner says that "Group III could be used to load and move any type of chattel, and Group IV could be used to move chattel within a warehouse or other storage facility." This ignores the claim limitations making it clear that the invention resides in a method of moving an animal to be milked by cart to an

unoccupied milking stall. Saying that the cart could be used for other purposes or in other locations ignores the claimed method steps.

. . .

3. Groups IV and V

As between the elected Group IV claims and the claims of Group V the Examiner says they are distinguished in that the claims of Group IV "are drawn to moving an animal into a transport cart and then into a milking stall, classified in class 119, subclass 412" and the Group V claims are "drawn to a milking parlor, classified in class 119, subclass 14.03."

As noted above, the classification of the Group IV claims in class 119, subclass 412 is inappropriate in that <u>none of the claims of the elected Group IV</u> recite a partition means.

Applicant urges that an appropriate search involving the claims of Group IV directed to a method of milking would inherently involve a search of the of the classes dealing with milking parlors. In fact, the appropriate classes have been searched in that the same reference from class 119 subclass 14.02 (Waybright, US 5, 483, 921) has been used to support an <u>anticipation</u> rejection of both the Group IV and Group V independent claims (Claims 32 and 42 respectively) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

4. Summary

In the Examiner's view, the claims of Groups II and IV have not acquired a separate field of search. The Examiner, herself has classified both groups in class 119, subclass 412 so there is no adequate basis for insisting on a restriction between these groups. The Examiner's characterization of the claims of Groups III and IV is incorrect in that both sets of claims involve a method including moving an animal to be milked onto a cart, translating the cart to an unoccupied milking stall and moving the animal from the cart and into the stall and there is nothing in these claims related to a partition means or to a feeding/watering means (class 119/412 and 119/408 respectively). The Group V milking parlor claims follow the Group IV method steps in that claims of both

groups recite both a milking stall and a cart translatable relative to the milking stall.

Applicant urges that there already has been a through review and search of the subject matter of the claims of the elected Group IV and of Groups II, III and V as evidenced by the fact that the same references, all from class 119 subclasses 14.02 and 14.03 have been applied in the rejection of the claims. Moreover, at least one of the references is applied as an anticipation reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) against claims of different groups!

In view of the above comments, Applicant urges that the restriction requirement as to the claims of the elected Group IV and of Groups II. III and V is in error and should be withdrawn.

As to the elected claims of Group IV, (and provisionally with respect to the claims of Groups II, III and V) Applicant is requesting a reinstatement of the appeal as these claims have been twice rejected.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Aceto, Registration No. 24, 554

HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP

1600 Bausch & Lomb Place Rochester, New York 14604 Telephone: 585-231-1118

Fax: 585-232-2152

Dated: September 24, 2004